

THERESE M. STEWART, State Bar # 104930
Chief Deputy City Attorney
WAYNE SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137
JONATHAN GIVNER, State Bar #208000
TARA M. STEELEY, State Bar #231775
Deputy City Attorneys
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682
Telephone: (415) 554-4694
Facsimile: (415) 554-4699
E-Mail: jon.givner@sfgov.org

Attorneys for Defendants

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
FREDERICK K. LOWELL, State Bar #66641
BRUCE A. ERICSON, State Bar #76342
bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com
ANITA D. STEARNS MAYO, State Bar #142749
MARC H. AXELBAUM, State Bar #209855
marc.axelbaum@pillsburylaw.com
50 Fremont Street
Post Office Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
Telephone: (415) 983-1000
Facsimile: (415) 983-1200

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON JOBS CANDIDATE
ADVOCACY FUND, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DENNIS J. HERRERA, in his official
capacity as City Attorney of the City and
County of San Francisco, et al.

Defendants.

Case No. C07-3199 JSW

**JOINT STATUS REPORT;
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to the Court's order dated May 12, 2011 (Dkt. 72), Plaintiffs Committee on JOBS Candidate Advocacy Fund and Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco Independent Expenditure PAC (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and Defendants Dennis J. Herrera, George Gascon, the Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, and the City and County of San Francisco (collectively, "Defendants"), jointly file this Status Report.

In this case, Plaintiffs contend that Sections 1.114(c)(1) and 1.114(c)(2) of the San Francisco Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance, codified in the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, and Regulation 1.114-2 of the Regulations to the CFRO, violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution by imposing limits on contributions to political committees for the purpose of making independent expenditures. The Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction on September 20, 2007 (Dkt. 37), and that order has remained in effect since then pursuant to a series of stipulated orders. At the parties' request, the Court stayed the litigation while the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals considered a case presenting similar issues, and while the parties explored settlement.

On May 11, 2011, the parties informed the Court that the parties have executed a written Settlement Agreement and Proposed Form of Permanent Injunction, but the agreement will not become binding unless and until it has been considered and approved by the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Supervisors (the "Board") and Mayor. Dkt. 71. In its Order on May 12, 2011, the Court instructed the parties to file a joint status report by July 11, 2011 if the Board and the Mayor had not yet approved the settlement. Dkt. 72.

On June 28, 2011, the Board preliminarily approved the settlement agreement by a 11-0 vote. Under the City's Charter, the Board must take a second, final vote on the settlement agreement before forwarding it to the Mayor for his consideration. *See* S.F. Charter § 2.105. Counsel anticipates that the Board will take that second vote at its next meeting on July 12, 2011. If the Board approves the agreement at that meeting, the Mayor will have ten days to consider the settlement agreement, and the agreement will become effective unless the Mayor vetoes it during that ten-day period. *See* S.F. Charter § 3.103.

1 If the Board and the Mayor finally approve the Settlement Agreement, the parties will submit
2 the Proposed Form of Permanent Injunction for the Court's consideration by no later than July 29,
3 2011. If the Board or the Mayor does not approve the Settlement Agreement, the parties will submit
4 a joint status report by no later than July 29, 2011, informing the Court of what they propose to do in
5 light of that decision.

6 Dated: July 7, 2011

7 THERESE M. STEWART
8 Chief Deputy City Attorney
9 WAYNE SNODGRASS
10 JONATHAN GIVNER
11 TARA M. STEELEY
12 Deputy City Attorneys

13 By: /s/ Jonathan Givner
14 JONATHAN GIVNER
15 Attorneys for Defendants

16 Dated: July 7, 2011

17 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
18 FREDERICK K. LOWELL
19 BRUCE A. ERICSON
20 ANITA D. STEARNS MAYO
21 MARC H. AXELBAUM

22 *By: /s/ Marc H. Axelbaum
23 MARC H. AXELBAUM
24 Attorneys for Plaintiffs


25 *Pursuant to GO 45, the electronic signatory has
26 obtained approval from this signatory.

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Pursuant to the agreement of the parties set forth in the foregoing Joint Status Report, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that by no later than July 29, 2011, the parties shall either submit a proposed form of permanent injunction for the Court's consideration pursuant to a final, executed settlement agreement, or if the Board of Supervisors or Mayor does not approve the agreement, submit a joint status report stating what the parties propose to do in light of that decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 7, 2011


Hon. Jeffrey S. White
United States District Judge